UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,250	07/05/2006	Noboru Ogasawara	292411US40PCT	6072
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			ALI, MOHAMMAD M	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3744	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/07/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/585,250	OGASAWARA, NOBORU	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MOHAMMAD M. ALI	3744	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron te, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 ∪</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration. or election requirement.		
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 05 July 2006 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11. 	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ne 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/585,250 Page 2

Art Unit: 3744

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-12, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Masahiro ET al (JP 10-205920 A). Masahiro et al disclose a condenser (23) comprising an inlet header (26a) and an outlet header (26b) spaced apart from each other in a left-right direction and extending vertically, a plurality of fiat refrigerant tubes (27 arranged one above another in parallel at a spacing between the two headers (26a and 26b) and jointed at opposite ends thereof to the respective headers and fins provided between respective adjacent pairs of refrigerant tubes, the inlet header (26a) having a refrigerant inlet (35) for admitting a refrigerant into interior thereof therethrough, the outlet header (26b) having a refrigerant outlet (34) for causing the refrigerant to flow out therethrough, the refrigerant as admitted into the inlet header (26a) through the inlet (35) being flowable through all the refrigerant tubes (27) toward the outlet header (26b), the number of refrigerant tubes positioned below the center of the refrigerant inlet (35) with respect to the vertical direction being up to 21. (the tube number being up to 21, indicates the upper limit is 21 and there is no specific lower limit, the number of tube under inlet 35 of Masahiro et al does not exceed 21 similar th the claimed invention as supported by Figs of the Applicant); fins (28),

different tube groups as shown by the blocks with arrows; a liquid tank (25), filter dryer (20). See Figs 1, 4, 5 and 6 and enclosed translation..

Regarding claims 1 and 6, the above disclose of Masahiro et al meet the limitations of claims 1 and 6.

Regarding claims 2 and 7, Masahiro et al disclose that the number of refrigerant tubes positioned below the center of the refrigerant inlet (25) with respect to the vertical direction is 6 as shown in Fig 1 and which does not exceed the up to 7 number.

Regarding claims 3 and 8, Masahiro et al disclose that total number of refrigerant tubes are 31 as shown in Fig 6 which between the number 22 to 70.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Masahiro et al disclose that a heat exchanger having a condenser (23) portion comprising supercooler portion (24) disposed under the condenser portion (23) and comprising a pair of headers (26a and 26b) spaced apart from each other in a left-right direction and extending vertically, a plurality of fiat refrigerant tubes (27) arranged one above another in parallel at a spacing between the two headers (26a and 26b) and jointed at opposite ends thereof to the respective headers and fins (28) provided between respective adjacent pairs of refrigerant tubes (27), the outlet header (26b) of the condenser portion (23) being provided with one of the headers of the supercooler portion (24) with a partition (see Fig 1) interposed therebetween, the inlet header of the condenser (23) portion being provided with the other header of the supercooler portion with a partition interposed therebetween, a receiver tank (25) being attached to both the outlet header of the condenser portion (23) and said one header of the supercooler portion

Art Unit: 3744

(24), the refrigerant as discharged from the refrigerant outlet of the condenser portion being flowable into said one

Regarding claims 15 and 17 Masahiro et al disclose an air conditioning or refrigeration system circuit. See Fig 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 4, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masahiro et al in view of Yamamoto et al (US 6,125,922), HU (US 20040261983 A1) and Kraft (US 20020070012 A1). Masahiro et al disclose the invention substantially as claimed as stated above condenser height, width/length, tube height/thickness and tube spacing (fin height). Yamamoto et al teach the use of a condenser height of 387.8 mm (within limit 150 to 500 mm of claimed invention), a left-right width/length of (300 to 700 mm, within the limit of 200 to 800 mm of claimed invention) in an condenser device for

Application/Control Number: 10/585,250

Art Unit: 3744

the purpose of maximizing the design criteria and working efficiency, see Fig. 2, 4-5, column 3, lines 19-65; Kraft teaches the use of tube thickness of 1.33 mm (within the limit of 08 to 3 mm of claimed invention) in designing an heat exchanger for having an optimum efficiency, see Para [0006].; Hu teaches the use of fin height of 10 mm (the spacing of tubes 28 in designing a heat exchanger for maximizing its efficiency, see claim 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the condenser device of Masahiro et al in view of Yamamoto et al and Hu such that condenser with height of 387.8 mm, left-right width/lent of 150 to 500 mm, a tube thickness of 1.33 and tube spacing of 10 mm could be provided in order to efficiently functioning the condensing or heat exchanging function.

Page 5

Claims 5, 10, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masahiro et al in view of Iso et al (JP 2003-106338 A).

Masahiro et al disclose the invention substantially as claimed as stated above except 3 to 10 mss % of compressor lubricating oil admixed. Iso et al teach the use of compressor oil with .1 to 20 mass % with admixed of organometallic salt for having a an efficient rust proof oil. See Abstract. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the condenser device of Masahiro et al in view of Iso et al such that an lubrication /compressor oil with .1 to 20 mass % of organometallic salt could provided in order to efficient and rust proof working.

Application/Control Number: 10/585,250 Page 6

Art Unit: 3744

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MOHAMMAD M. ALI whose telephone number is (571)272-4806. The examiner can normally be reached on maxiflex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl J. Tyler can be reached on 571-272-4808. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mohammad M Ali/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3744